GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9410**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Marshall Islands, Niue, Tonga, Tuvalu)**		
Project Title:	**Strengthening National and Regional Capacities to Reduce the Impact of Invasive Alien Species on Globally Significant Biodiversity in the Pacific**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-2 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$182,650**	Project Grant:	**$6,252,489**
Co-financing:	**$12,680,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$18,932,489**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Sarah Wyatt**	Agency Contact Person:	**Greg Sherley**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	April 15, 2016 No. Generally, the project seems aligned to the GEF strategy, however, it's important to remember to follow the specifics of the strategy, specifically the focus on prevent, policy and very limited eradication and restoration. At this point, because of the lack of clarity of project activities it is difficult to assure that	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		this alignment is happening. More detail is needed about the activities that will be undertaken, for example, the species that will targeted through these interventions through the eradication interventions. July 14, 2016 No. Please address the issues raised under other questions to help bring the project into alignment with GEF strategies. Please note that the GEF does not support any conventions or agreements other than those that we are a financial mechanism for, including national communications. Please remove references to supporting national communications for non-GEF conventions. October 4, 2016 Yes, thank you for the revisions. During PPG, please consider adding process indicators for component 3.2 to accompany the species population numbers to examine the effectiveness of the interventions. The actual eradication could be an indicator itself. Some GEF projects while	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		effective in their interventions have difficulty measuring changes in target populations during lifetime of the project.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	April 15, 2016 Yes. This project is aligned with relevant national strategies and conventions.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	April 15, 2016 No. Financial sustainability is crucial for the success of IAS prevention and management and it is not adequately addressed through this project. Please address the issue of financial sustainability. July 14, 2016 No. In particular, financial sustainability remains a stumbling block for this project. We understand the challenges for the SIDS in finding co-financing, but those actually make it even more important to use this project to establish the systems to generate long-term, sustainable financing for IAS activities. The description of component 4 seems to focus on conducting and presenting a study on the options for sustainable	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		financing, but little the actual implementation. While a study is an important first step, it has little value unless implemented. October 4, 2016 Yes. Please give the question of financial sustainability of project interventions a strong focus during PPG.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	April 15, 2016 No, while there certainly some baseline activities already underway, please clarify how the GEF resources are capitalizing on existing initiatives. Also, is there a relationship between this project and the Pacific Invasives Initiative (http://rce.pacificinvasivesinitiative.org)? July 14, 2016 No, while the revised PIF shows some progress in this area it is still unclear how the October 4, 2016 Yes, thank you for making it more clear the on-going activities in each country that this project will build	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		upon.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	April 15, 2016 No, overall it is quite difficult to follow which activities will be undertaken in which countries. In the body of the PIF, it could be helpful to break out subcomponents and/or national activities. Component 1 - 1.1.1 - What will these advisory groups will be doing? (this should be primary concern) and then how they will be composed. - 1.1.3 - Please clarify if the NISSAPs will only be reviewed or something more. - 1.1.5 - Please clarify who is on the implementation team? And if they are already in existence? Component 2 - Please clarify exactly what will be undertaken in this component and provide more information on this area of work for this component. Component 3 - Please note that the GEF does not focus on IAS control efforts. - Please identify either the targeted species or sites for the eradication programs.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		- Please clarify the relationship (if any) between the control, eradication, and restoration activities. Component 4 - This component needs significant reconsideration. Regional resources should be for activities that are truly regional (not a collection of country activities). This should not be activities that have the potential to be scaled up, but instead providing benefits to the whole region and used. - As such, it would be helpful to share if any consultation has been done with the other countries. - Please clarify if this project will include the entire Pacific region or only certain subregions? - Please explain how this project coordinate with a similar initiative in the Caribbean or other global activities? July 14, 2016 No, overall the description of this project remains difficult to follow. Given the complexity of the project, clarity in the description is particularly important. It may help to break out the separate outputs, outcomes and/or activities in section	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		1.3 to facilitate reading. At points, it seems as though the activities described in Table B do not seem to line up with what is being described in section 1.3. Again creating subsections rather than long narrative paragraphs may help address this issue. This could also address the issue that the description does not systematically lay out project activities and, where there are gaps in plans, state where decisions/plans will be made during PPG. Financial sustainability needs to be strengthened both in the national and regional components. It would be worth considering increasing the focus on financial sustainability in Table B and the indicators provided. The success of any IAS effort is fundamentally dependent on the ability to finance it over the long term. The level of engagement and responsibilities of the different institutions, particularly specialists such as Island Conservation, is unclear. Please provide more detail. Component 1: - 1.1.4 - The second part of this output	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		is providing advice to other countries on implementing their NISSAP. The rest of this component is nationally focused, so this seems a bit out of place. There is very little description of these activities in section 1.3. Would this fit better under component 4 (regional work)? - How will this project work to harmonize biosecurity laws across the region when only a small number of countries will participate in this project? Component 2: - Component 2 is kind of confusing with the component, outcome, outputs, and indicators not hanging together coherently. It may help to break 2.1 into multiple shorter and complementary outcomes. - The first paragraph on this component in section 1.3 is confusing and would benefit from a review and edit. For instance, what "variables" are being measured in sentence 3? A key word or two seems to be missing from sentence 2. - The use of CI's Biodiversity Hotspots to identify globally significant biodiversity within these countries is confusing as the entirety of these countries are within Hotspots and, thus, won't help to identify sites.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		KBAs are better as they are site-level distinctions. It may also help to look for threatened species according to the IUCN Red List or endemic species. Component 3: - Appearing on the IUCN Red List, does not make a species "globally significant" nor does it mean that it is threatened. It simply means that its threat status has been assessed. There are some notable gaps in global coverage - reptiles, marine species, invertebrates. There may be important and/or endemic species that would qualify as threatened but have yet to be assessed and could be justified as targets of GEF intervention based on the IUCN criteria. - It seems to be missing some process indicators. While impact indicators are very important, it would be good to include indicators along the way to reaching those goals. If these are covered by indicators for other sections, it would be good reference these relationships. - 3.2.2 - As the other species would qualify the site for focus this is not a major concern, however, a Near Threatened species is by definition not threatened. We encourage a focus on threatened and endemic (or	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		similarly small ranged) species. - 3.2.2 - The scale of these interventions seems very different between the two countries. In Tonga, two larger island groups plus one island. In RMI, one small island. How were the Tonga sites selected? Given the human populations on those islands and the need for undisturbed habitat for some of the priority species, will the eradication make a significant difference for these species? What are the other two countries planning on working on or will those sites be selected later? If the later, please indicate the criteria and when and how the selection will be made. - The restoration activities need further explanation. Are they limited to one country? While the description says that they will be linked to other project interventions, is there a process to select these locations? - In Annex 2 the species name for the Tongan Whistler is wrong. Component 4 - The regional support service remains difficult to understand from the description. How will it work? Where will it be housed? How will it be managed and coordinated? - Annex 3 is not especially helpful in	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		providing a structure or understanding of the program as it feels like mostly buzzwords. A diagram could be helpful to explain the relationship between the different parts, but it would have be significantly revised. - In order to qualify for regional resources, the efforts of the regional support service cannot be limited to only the countries participating in this project but rather all the countries in the region. - It still remains unclear which countries are considered part of this region - all Pacific islands? - Coordination with the new GEF/UNEP Caribbean project and other initiatives still needs further consideration. - The long term sustainability (both financial and management) of the information management system still needs to be addressed. October 4, 2016 The project is much improved though some issues remain. Thank you for the restructuring that made the PIF much easier to follow. Component 3: - 3.2.2 - The plans for the development of rat and IAS	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Eradication Plans is unclear. The PIF states that it will be done for 4 island groups, yet only two island groups (Vava'u and Tongatapu) are mentioned in this section. If only some of the islands within the island groups are going to be targeted, it would be good to state that at the beginning (even if which islands to be targeted remains to be decided during PPG). The plans also mention other IAS, will these plans discuss and implement the eradication of additional species? If so, how will these species be selected? - 3.2.3 - It remains unclear why these sites will be chosen. From the GEF perspective, it is not imperative for the restoration sites to be linked to the eradication/control sites (unless this is for logistical/administrative reasons). It actually seems a bit confusing as the eradication efforts seem to focus on rats, while restoration often focuses on areas of invasive plant removal. Restoration does need to directly benefit a threatened species. Please clarify this issue. - Outcomes 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 are the same in section 1.3. Component 4: - 4.1.2 - Beyond having money allocated out of limited national	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		treasure resources based on studies of IAS, how will the regional support service develop financial sustainability? - 4.1.4 - Who will maintain the information system following the conclusion of the project? Also, please change the agency fee in very first table to match the agency fee without PPG (or the total agency fee in table D). And, fix the formatting issue in table B (the strikethrough font). November 22, 2016 Yes. Thank you for the revisions.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	April 15, 2016 Yes. There is good involvement of CSOs and gender. At PPG, please discuss the role of local CSOs. November 22, 2016 Also, at PPG please include how traditional ecological knowledge and management systems will be incorporated as appropriate.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	April 15, 2016 No. Because of a new project (Outer Island Renewable Energy Project - GEFID 9355_ Tonga has only 1,697,650 remaining in their STAR allocation. All the other countries do have enough resources. July 14, 2016 Yes. Thank you for the revision.	
	• The focal area allocation?	April 15, 2016 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Focal area set-aside?	April 15, 2016 No, as stated previously, focal area set-asides are limited to regional and global activities. Please revise this section to focus on activities that fit this criteria. Not all of the requested resources are being spent in component 4, so please provide that clarification. July 14, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		No, please address the issues raised under question 5. Also, as still not all of the resources are being used in component 4, which is the regional component, please explain how and where those resources will be used. Set aside resources should be focused on activities that have significant impact when undertaken at that level. Please ensure a strong justification of these benefits. November 22, 2016 Yes. Thank you for the revisions.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	April 15, 2016 No. Please address the issues raised under questions 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7. July 15, 2015 No. Please address the issues raised under questions 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7. October 7, 2016 No. While the PIF has made significant progress, there are still some remaining issues that need to be clarified. November 22, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		The program manager recommends this project for CEO clearance.	
Review Date	Review	April 15, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 15, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 07, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation			
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		